

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 11 are pending in the above application. By the above amendment, claims 9 and 10 have been cancelled and claim 11 has been added.

The Office Action dated September 28, 2005, has been received and carefully reviewed. In that Office Action, claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Abe. Because it is believed that claims 1-8 are not anticipated by Abe, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Examination of new claim 11 is also respectfully requested. Claim 11 is essentially a combination of original claims 1 and 2 and also requires that the output of a sensor unit be provided to a circuit board through the connection part. It is not believed that claim 11 raises new issues that would require further consideration and search, and the examination of this new claim is therefore also respectfully requested. However, in the event the examiner believes claim 11 raises new issues, and if claims 1-8 are not allowed, it is respectfully requested that the examiner address the remarks directed to unamended claims 1-8.

CLAIM 1

Claim 1 requires a torque detecting apparatus that includes a circuit board and a connection part that are “integrally coated with synthetic resin.” This is not shown in Abe, and the Office Action does not allege that this feature is shown in Abe. Instead, it is stated that Abe shows a ceramic circuit board 22, a connection part 19 formed of a synthetic material, and a housing 1 formed of synthetic material that encloses the circuit board. For purposes of argument only, for this response only, these statements will be accepted as true. Even taking these statements as true, however, Abe does not show a circuit board and a connection part integrally coated with synthetic resin as claimed. As shown by the enclosed definition of “coat” from the Merriam-Webster online dictionary (www.m-w.com) a “coat” is a layer of one substance covering another, for example, a “coat” of paint. No layer of material integrally coats Abe’s circuit board and connection part. Housing 1 of Abe at least partially surrounds the circuit board and the connection part, but these elements are not “coated,” much less “integrally coated” with synthetic resin as required by claim 1. In other words, it cannot be said that the circuit board and

connection part are coated with a housing. Claim 1 is submitted to be allowable over Abe for at least this reason.

CLAIM 5

Claim 5 also requires a layer of synthetic material integrally coating the circuit board and connection part and is submitted to distinguish over Abe for the reasons provided above in connection with claim 1. In addition, claim 5 requires a circuit board electrically connected to the sensor by a connection part. Element 19 of Abe is a resin and thus an insulator and does not electrically connect the circuit board and sensor as claimed. Claim 5 further distinguishes over Abe for this reason.

CLAIM 11

New claim 11 also requires that a circuit board and connection part and the sensor unit, be integrally coated with synthetic resin. Claim 11 is therefore submitted to be allowable for the same reasons provided above in connection with claim 1. In addition, claim 11 requires that the output of the sensor unit be supplied to the circuit board through the connection part. Abe does not show an output of a sensor unit being supplied to a circuit board through connection part 19 as required by claim 11, and claim 11 is submitted to be allowable over Abe for this reason as well.

CONCLUSION

Each issue raised in the Office Action dated September 28, 2005, has been addressed, and it is believed that claims 1-8 and 11 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-8 and examination and allowance of claim 11 is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Scott Wakeman (Reg. No. 37,750) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Application No. 10/765,980
Amendment dated December 28, 2005
After Final Office Action of September 28, 2005

Docket No.: 1560-0406P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 28, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Michael K. Mutter
Registration No.: 29,680
Scott T. Wakeman
Registration No.: 37,750
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorneys for Applicant